

81 01939


Association of Bay Area Governments, San
Francisco Bay Area.

Regional plan amendments for 1981--
CEQA recommendation and review and
approval schedule. Berkeley, July 2, 1981
19p.

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

AUG 25 1981

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C123308015>

8101939

[ABAG]

July 2, 1981

TO: Executive Board

FM: Supervisor Joe Bort, Chair
Regional Planning Committee

RE: Regional Plan Amendments for 1981--CEQA Recommendation and
Review and Approval Schedule

At its July 1 meeting, the Regional Planning Committee reviewed the attached Initial Study for the proposed Regional Plan amendments for Economic Development, Energy, Urban Development and Open Space. Based on this review,

RPC recommends: that the Executive Board direct the Executive Director to prepare a Negative Declaration for the proposed plan amendments; and

requests: that the Board approve the Regional Plan Amendment Schedule--1981 and place on the agenda of its September 17 meeting a Public Hearing on the proposed amendments.

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUL 22 1981

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

81 01939

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUL 29 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUL 29 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

REGIONAL PLAN AMENDMENT SCHEDULE--1981

REGIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

EXECUTIVE BOARD

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

July 1

Receive recommended amendments, impact assessments for:

ENERGY
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
OPEN SPACE

Review Initial Study; begin CEQA process for plan amendments.

July 23

Action on CEQA requirements (Negative Declaration or DEIR).
Schedule public hearing for September meeting.

August 5

Public discussion on proposed amendments.
RPC discussion and action.
Forward to Executive Board.

September 17

Public hearing on proposed amendments.
Executive Board action.
Forward to General Assembly.

October 24

Make CEQA findings.
Discussion and approval of amendments:

ENERGY
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
URBAN DEVELOPMENT
OPEN SPACE



Association of Bay Area Governments

Hotel Claremont • Berkeley, California 94705 • (415) 841-9730

June 29, 1981

TO: Regional Planning Committee

FM: Doug Detling, Legislative Affairs Officer *Doug*
Yvonne San Jule, Principal Regional Planner *Y.S.*

RE: Initial Study for Proposed 1981 Regional Plan Amendments

Description of the Project

The project consists of amendments to the Regional Plan of the Association of Bay Area Governments. The amendments proposed cover the following topics: economic development, energy, and plan strategies for open space, new communities, and urban development.

Amendments dealing with economic development are the recommended implementing actions for economic development objectives and policies adopted as Regional Plan amendments by ABAG's General Assembly in December 1980. These objectives and policies were assessed pursuant to CEQA and are reassessed in view of the specific actions recommended.

Amendments dealing with energy include a regional energy goal, five objectives, and associated policies and actions. Implicit in the wording and order of the objectives are priorities in energy planning for the Bay Area. The five objectives are:

- o To make energy efficiency the first priority in the Bay Area so that demand can be reduced significantly by the year 2000;
- o To promote the development of renewable energy supplies available within the region;
- o To develop new non-renewable energy supplies only after significant progress has been made in achieving energy efficiency (which may include expansion of existing facilities) and in developing renewable energy supplies;
- o To reduce the financial impact of rising energy prices, particularly on economically disadvantaged persons; and
- o To integrate and ensure consistency of future energy programs with existing regional programs in environmental management and all other regional planning activities

For plan amendments dealing with economic development and energy, the proposed project includes actions for ABAG (assigned to categories service, review, or advocacy) and recommendations to other public agencies and the private sector.

Also included in the proposed project are amendments to Regional Plan strategies for urban development, open space, and new communities. Regional strategies of the plan are unified sets of policies that implement multiple objectives contained in the housing, economic development, environmental quality, safety, recreation, and transportation chapters. These strategies represented the views of local decision-makers in the late 1960s about how they wanted the Bay Area to grow over the next 20 years.

Since 1970, in approving more specific plan elements, 110 objectives, policies, and associated actions have been adopted supporting the city-centered concept of regional growth, and 49 encouraging preservation of the regional open space system.

The amendments proposed to the regional strategies respond to the more specific provisions of regional policy adopted since the development of the regional strategies in the original Regional Plan.

The plan amendments will be furnished upon request to interested parties. For the convenience of the reader and because of their length, they are only summarized in this initial study.

Identification of the Environmental Setting

The amendments recommended, as portions of the Regional Plan, apply to the entire nine-county Bay Area and its cities (see attached map). A description of the environmental setting is contained in Part I of the Regional Plan 1980, San Francisco Bay Area.

Identification of Effects

The Regional Plan is an integrated document to be read and applied as a whole. Specific objectives, policies, and actions are to be undertaken in coordination with the balance of the plan.

Table 1 identifies the effects attributable to the actions implementing adopted economic development objectives and policies.

Table 2 identifies the effects attributable to the proposed energy goal, objectives, and policies. Table 3 identifies the effects attributable to changes in the plan's regional strategies. Actions undertaken by ABAG would be done in coordination with other objectives, policies, and actions of the Regional Plan.

Implementation of the proposed policies and actions will not have significant adverse environmental effects. The actions specified for economic development and energy, plus the regional strategies, should result in improvements to the environmental quality of the region, when implemented in coordination with other parts of the Regional Plan.

The Bay Area is projected to have at least one million more people by the year 2000, according to ABAG's Projections '79. These projections are used in all ABAG planning programs, including those for air and water quality planning.

ABAG's water quality plan calls for the development of additional wastewater treatment facilities to accommodate projected growth in the region. The air quality and water supply management provisions of the environmental quality chapter of the Regional Plan are based on the same population level. Therefore, the provisions of housing to serve population growth anticipated by the projections will not have significant adverse air quality effects. No additional increment of housing over and above that assumed in the development of the environmental quality chapter would be generated by implementing the proposed economic development activities. Proposed economic development actions and regional strategies that would improve the distribution of jobs and housing regionwide would tend to improve air quality beyond that expected from implementation of current or scheduled programs. These would also tend to reduce energy consumption by reducing the growth in regionwide travel.

Similarly, there would be no significant adverse water quality or water supply effects from population growth (and the housing units necessary to accommodate that growth) because increased demand for both wastewater treatment capacity and water supply are accommodated by existing regional policies adopted by ABAG and approved or recognized by state and federal agencies. While localized surface runoff problems may occur from construction activities associated with implementation actions calling for increased construction, these would tend to be minimized by implementation of surface runoff control programs already adopted by local governments and implementation of policies of the water quality management plan. In implementing the environmental quality chapter, ABAG has undertaken an aggressive role to alleviate, prevent, and therefore mitigate such construction-related surface runoff pollution. Beyond this, control of any localized surface runoff that might occur from project-specific construction is within the jurisdiction of local agencies that must also comply with CEQA when approving plans and projects. No significant adverse surface runoff effects will occur as a result of implementation of the proposed project.

Growth in the region will mean additional residential, commercial, and industrial consumption of energy. ABAG's Regional Plan recognizes the need to have an assured supply of energy to accommodate growth projected for the region. These policies also recognize that assuring adequate, reliable sources of energy must take place consistent with other regional objectives (such as, protection of environmental quality).

The economic development policies adopted by ABAG's General Assembly last December did not presume the appropriate mix of conservation and generation of energy, nor the mix of new energy sources. They did call for an examination of actions that would assure adequate, reliable sources of energy for the region.

As part of its planning programs during the past year, ABAG has conducted such an examination, and regional energy objectives and policies are recommended by the proposed project. Specifically, the amendments recommend coordinated and concentrated actions to reduce energy demand, develop renewable energy supplies, and to develop new non-renewable supplies when significant progress has been made in achieving energy efficiency in the region.

Other plan amendments will assist in the region's efforts to reduce energy consumption or slow its growth rate. Therefore, no adverse energy consumption effects will occur from implementation of the proposed project.

Similarly, certain plan amendments promote the construction of industries that cause air pollution. The energy policies recognize the potential short-term air quality benefit of delaying fossil-fuel-fired power plants, but that these sources might be constructed in the future. So long as all sources continue to be subject to regulations of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, which regulations are included in ABAG's air quality plan, no significant adverse air quality effects can be attributed to the policies and actions recommended by the 1981 ABAG Regional Plan amendments.

Higher density housing or office development may result in a loss of amenities. Actions recommended do not promote a specific density for housing or office development. While such densities would likely be higher than densities for development projects currently being approved, they are not likely to be higher than densities now in existence in the region. Dealing with such environmental resources as "amenities" is largely a matter of dealing with perceptions. These perceptions may vary widely. Design and development can provide more amenities as well as fewer amenities. This type of analysis is best conducted on a project-specific or site-specific basis. At the regional level, changes in amenities as a result of the proposed plan amendments would not be significant.

Taken as a whole, the economic development, energy, and regional strategies amendments proposed for addition to the Regional Plan will not have significant environmental effects as defined by CEQA.

Discussion of Ways to Mitigate the Significant Effects Identified

No mitigation measures are necessary because no significant adverse environmental effects are expected to result from the proposed amendments. Implementation of these plan amendments is accomplished primarily by ABAG through technical services, advocacy, and the review of local, regional, state, and federal plans and projects. Such review may include suggested mitigation measures consistent with all Regional Plan policies. The governmental agency responsible for the project or plan will consider mitigating any project-specific significant environmental effects at the time the proposal is made and discussed.

Examination of Whether the Project is Compatible with Existing Zoning and Plans

The project may result in the ABAG Executive Board's support of changes in local general plans and zoning that (1) promote the concentration of jobs in areas well served by housing, transportation, and public facilities; (2) increase housing production to match planned employment growth and new household formation; and (3) promote energy efficiency.

Initial Study Prepared by:

ABAG staff members Doug Detling, Cynthia Kroll, Patrick Mason, Linda Morse, and Yvonne San Jule.

RECOMMENDATION: The Regional Planning Committee is asked to recommend to the Executive Board that the Executive Director be directed to prepare a Negative Declaration for the proposed plan amendments.

IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS FOR OBJECTIVE 1: EXPAND OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMMUNITIES AND POPULATION GROUPS NOT NOW FULLY SHARING IN THE REGION'S ECONOMY

ENVIRONMENTAL	INSTITUTIONAL/FINANCIAL	ECONOMIC	SOCIAL
<u>Air Quality</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No significant increase in emissions regionwide; may result in changes in location of emissions but all subject to BAAQMD regulations o Transit improvements and reduced growth in vehicle travel would improve air quality. 	<u>Institutional</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o May result in changes in local policies and ordinances, setting of local government priorities, and use of tax incentives in some communities to attract industry o May result in greater cooperation among local governments, employers, organized labor, and the educational system 	<u>Production of Goods, Services</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Indirectly may cause increased prices for goods and services in distressed areas because of associated housing speculation, condominium conversions of rental housing, increased retail prices 	<u>Housing Supply</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Housing stock in some communities would be improved through expanded economic development opportunities
<u>Surface/Groundwater</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact 	<u>Financial</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Local governments - possible increased costs of implementing new regulations; Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) and Private Industry Council (PIC) federal grant applicants may have increased costs to mitigate effects noted in project review; costs borne by jurisdictions if capital investment programs do not receive federal or state funding 	<u>Employment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Increased employment of resident population o Possible attraction of job seekers to the region 	<u>Physical Mobility</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Mobility improved in some communities through upgraded transit systems and general economic revitalization
<u>Physical Resources</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact 		<u>Income and Investment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact 	<u>Health and Safety</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact
<u>Energy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact 		<u>Consumer Expenditures</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impacts 	<u>Sense of Community</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Community improvements in distressed areas
<u>Amenities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Possible increase in recreation, cultural opportunities due to community revitalization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o All governmental levels - costs associated with business assistance programs; mitigation measures taken by project sponsors (developers, firms, local governments) to contribute to job training, affordable housing, improved transportation services; redevelopment programs wherein tax increments are returned to improve community o ABAG - increased costs to maintain level of service, advocacy, and review functions 		<u>Equity</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Increased training and employment opportunities for unemployed and underemployed
			<u>Urban Patterns</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No significant impact unless in some older cities if office development is tied to urban renewal, transportation improvements

IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS FOR OBJECTIVE 2: PRESERVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA, A MAJOR CONTRIBUTOR TO THE REGION'S
DEVELOPMENT

IMPACTS NOTED IN EIR FOR ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN, VOLUME II, JUNE 1978.

No significant additional environmental impacts.

IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS FOR OBJECTIVE 3: STRENGTHEN THE BAY AREA'S POSITION AS A PRIME LOCATION FOR OFFICE ACTIVITIES AND HIGH TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRIES
AND PROMOTE CONCENTRATIONS OF THESE ACTIVITIES IN AREAS THAT CAN PROVIDE NEEDED HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION,
AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

ENVIRONMENTAL	INSTITUTIONAL/FINANCIAL	ECONOMIC	SOCIAL
<u>Air Quality</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Significant improvement through improved jobs/housing balance regionwide 	<u>Institutional</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Would require greater cooperation between local governments, employers, and industrial developers o Would require changes in permit system in some communities 	<u>Production of Goods, Services</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact 	<u>Housing Supply</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Possible mitigation costs to some older communities in which residents are displaced due to urban revitalization and/or transportation improvements o Improved coordination between office/high technology industrial park developers and local planning officials would help reduce jobs/housing imbalance in some communities
<u>Surface/Groundwater</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact 	<u>Financial</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Increased costs to come communities for housing, transportation, and public facilities needed to attract office and high technology industries 	<u>Employment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Increase in total employment opportunities o Improved distribution of employment opportunities throughout the region 	
<u>Physical Resources</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reduced consumption of undeveloped land in outlying areas 		<u>Income and Investment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact 	<u>Physical Mobility</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact
<u>Energy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Possible benefit if new office and high technology activities locate in communities near to employee residential areas o Potential increase consumption through accommodation of growth 		<u>Consumer Expenditures</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact 	<u>Health and Safety</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact
<u>Amenities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Minor loss if high density office and technology industries are perceived as a problem; not significant at regional level 			<u>Sense of Community</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Increased office and high technology employment in communities with needed housing, transportation, and public facilities
			<u>Equity</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact
			<u>Urban Patterns</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o New concentrations of industrial parks in various parts of region

IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS FOR OBJECTIVE 4: RETAIN THE BAY AREA'S EXISTING INDUSTRIES AND SUPPORT GROWTH OF ADDITIONAL INDUSTRIES WHICH CONTRIBUTE TO A HEALTHY, DIVERSE ECONOMY FOR THE REGION

ENVIRONMENTAL	INSTITUTIONAL/FINANCIAL	ECONOMIC	SOCIAL
<u>Air Quality</u>	<u>Institutional</u>	<u>Production of Goods, Services</u>	<u>Housing Supply</u>
o No impact	o Would require some local and regional regulatory agencies to streamline permit process to assist housing industry and small businesses	o Reduction of unemployment and underemployment through retention and expansion of existing industries	o No impact
<u>Surface/Groundwater</u>			<u>Physical Mobility</u>
o No impact	o Would require closer cooperation between public and private sectors	<u>Employment</u>	o No impact
<u>Physical Resources</u>		o No impact on job creation	<u>Health and Safety</u>
o Preservation of some agricultural land	<u>Financial</u>	o Possible reduction in unemployment levels among skilled and semi-skilled blue collar occupations	o No impact
<u>Energy</u>	o Some public and private costs associated with completing convention and tourism facilities in larger cities	<u>Income and Investment</u>	<u>Sense of Community</u>
o Possible benefit from installation of energy conservation or solar equipment	o Local costs associated with efforts to retain and encourage expansion of industries	o Continued capital investment for replacement facilities and equipment	o More stable economy will benefit communities
o Potential increased consumption of energy through accommodation of expansion plans by existing industries	o ABAG - increased costs to maintain service, advocacy, and review functions	<u>Consumer Expenditures</u>	<u>Equity</u>
		o No impact	o Increased involvement of community groups in developing programs to retain industries or mitigate the impacts of closures
<u>Amenities</u>			<u>Urban Patterns</u>
o Increased local and tourist recreation, cultural, and entertainment opportunities			o No impact

IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS FOR OBJECTIVE 5: INCREASE HOUSING PRODUCTION TO MATCH ANTICIPATED EMPLOYMENT GROWTH, NEW HOUSEHOLD FORMATION, AND THE CAPACITY OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES TO PROVIDE NEEDED PUBLIC FACILITIES AND SERVICES

IMPACT ASSESSMENT SHOWN IN EIR for the Regional Housing Plan (January 1978). Other effects include:

ENVIRONMENTAL	INSTITUTIONAL/FINANCIAL	SOCIAL
<u>Energy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Significant savings from more energy-efficient housing and shorter commutes o Possible negative impact if energy efficiency and conservation measures are deleted during construction to cut costs of new housing o Probable benefit of mixed use development would be decreased dependence on auto travel and reduction in consumption of fuel 	<u>Financial</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Possible loss of revenues for local governments if state and federal aid would be conditioned on local efforts to provide affordable housing o Cost to local governments of providing affordable housing 	<u>Housing Supply</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Promotion of higher density and infill development may conflict with goals to preserve existing housing in some communities <u>Sense of Community</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Promotion of higher density and infill development may conflict with goals to preserve existing pattern of housing and neighborhood facilities in some communities

IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS FOR OBJECTIVE 6: ENCOURAGE FOCUSED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT THROUGH COORDINATED PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POLICIES AND ACTIONS THAT WILL MEET IDENTIFIED PUBLIC NEEDS OF THE REGION

ENVIRONMENTAL	INSTITUTIONAL/FINANCIAL	ECONOMIC	SOCIAL
<u>Air Quality</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact 	<u>Institutional</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Would require streamlining of permit approval process in local and regional regulatory agencies o Would require greater coordination of capital investment programs among public agencies at all levels of government and in the private sector o Benefit of early recognition/specification of private and public investment needs in capital improvement programs o Possible changes in local general plans to enable better balance among public development policies 	<u>Employment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Improved distribution of employment patterns o Increased overall employment level 	<u>Housing Supply</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact
<u>Surface/Groundwater</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact 			<u>Physical Mobility</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact
<u>Physical Resources</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reduced consumption of undeveloped land o Preservation of outlying critical environmental areas o Possible loss of public sites suitable for open space uses in urban areas, due to increased pressure for housing and industrial growth 			<u>Health and Safety</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact
			<u>Sense of Community</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact
<u>Energy</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Probable benefit of increased transit access and clustering of jobs will be a reduction in commute distances and conservation of fuels 	<u>Financial</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Public agencies - costs associated with regional data requests and modified work programs during review process of local capital investment projects o ABAG - costs associated with maintaining service, advocacy, and review functions 		<u>Equity</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o No impact
<u>Amenities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Preservation of outlying scenic areas o Reduction and increased cost of urban land available for recreation and historic preservation 			<u>Urban Patterns</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o More city-centered urban growth over the long term

OBJECTIVE 1: TO MAKE ENERGY EFFICIENCY THE FIRST PRIORITY IN THE BAY AREA SO THAT DEMAND CAN BE REDUCED SIGNIFICANTLY BY THE YEAR 2000 (Policy 1.1)

ENVIRONMENTAL	INSTITUTIONAL/FINANCIAL	ECONOMIC	SOCIAL
<u>Air Quality</u> o No impacts	<u>Financial</u> o <u>Direct Cost - Public</u> May be costs to public for implementation o <u>Fiscal Effects on Local Governments</u> Costs of instituting local energy programs and enforcing regulations; costs of installing energy conservation measures in government facilities. Long term savings on utility bills.	<u>Production of Goods and Services</u> o Increased demand for energy conservation equipment; may stimulate local industry.	<u>Housing Supply</u> o Possible initial impact on price of housing.
<u>Water Quality</u> o Benefits where energy efficient site planning decreases impervious surfaces and decreases urban runoff.		<u>Income and Investment</u> o May stimulate investment in energy products and services	<u>Physical Mobility</u> o No impact
<u>Physical Resources</u> o No impacts		<u>Consumer Expenditures</u> o Cost to consumer of installation of equipment resulting in short-term adverse impact. This will be balanced by long-term benefit of savings on utility bills.	<u>Health and Safety</u> o Possibility of increased indoor air pollution due to reduced air exchange and of associated health effect.
<u>Energy</u> o Significant direct benefits as energy is conserved.	<u>Institutional</u> o Will require modifications in local policies, ordinances	<u>Employment</u> o May stimulate jobs in related manufacturing and services.	<u>Sense of Community</u> o No impact
<u>Amenities</u> o Possible minor benefit due to increased comfort in homes and businesses from reduced air infiltration into buildings.			<u>Equity</u> o Possible impact on home renters if programs are not applied equally to homeowners and renters.
			<u>Urban Patterns</u> o Possible changes in building orientation and street patterns.

OBJECTIVE 3: TO DEVELOP NEW NON-RENEWABLE ENERGY SUPPLIES ONLY AFTER SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS HAS BEEN MADE IN ACHIEVING ENERGY EFFICIENCY (WHICH MAY INCLUDE EXPANSION OF EXISTING FACILITIES) AND IN DEVELOPING RENEWABLE ENERGY SUPPLIES

ENVIRONMENTAL

INSTITUTIONAL/FINANCIAL

ECONOMIC

SOCIAL

Air Quality

- o Possible benefits to the extent that conservation and renewable energy delay the construction of fossil fuel power plants.

Water Quality

- o Possible benefits to extent that conservation and renewables replace power plants requiring cooling water.

Physical Resources

- o Possible benefits to extent that conservation and renewables replace power plants fueled by energy sources requiring extensive land or outer-continental shelf exploration and development.

Energy

- o Possible benefits to extent that there is a reduction in demand and a shift to a renewable resource supply base.

Amenities

- o No impacts

Financial

- o Direct Cost - Public

No impact

- o Fiscal Effects on Local Governments

Potential cost savings in internal operations and revenue producing opportunities from sale of locally generated electricity from renewables.

Institutional

- o Possible impacts on utility planning activities

Production of Goods and Services

- o Possible benefit to extent that demand for energy conservation and renewables stimulate locally-based industry.

Income and Investment

- o Possible benefit to extent that conservation and renewables create local investment opportunities and result in utility bill savings that can be recycled into the local economy.

Consumer Expenditures

- o Possible benefit to extent that conservation and renewables help reduce dollars spent on utility bills.

Employment

- o No impact

Housing Supply

- o No impact

Physical Mobility

- o No impact

Health and Safety

- o Possible benefit to extent conservation and renewables replace fossil-fuel power plants with associated health hazards.
- o Possible impacts to extent conservation and renewables bring their own health and safety hazards; air emissions from solid waste-to-energy facilities or indoor air pollution from reduced air exchange in homes.

Sense of Community

- o Possible benefit in increased sense of community self-reliance.

Equity

- o No impact

Urban Patterns

- o No impact

OBJECTIVE 4: TO REDUCE THE FINANCIAL IMPACT OF RISING ENERGY PRICES,
PARTICULARLY ON ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED PERSONS

ENVIRONMENTAL

Air Quality

- o No impact

Water Quality

- o No impact

Physical Resources

- o No impact

Energy

- o No impact

Amenities

- o No impact

INSTITUTIONAL/FINANCIAL

Financial

- o Direct Cost - Public

Possible costs to State and Federal agencies in reducing impact of energy prices.

- o Fiscal Effects on Local Governments

Direct impact on local agencies that must allocate stafftime and funds to initiate programs.

Institutional

- o Direct impact on agencies that must implement programs.

ECONOMIC

Production of Goods and Services

- o No impact

Income and Investments

- o Possible increase in investment in energy efficiency measures for new and existing housing by homeowners and landlords.

Consumer Expenditures

- o Possible reduction in utility costs for occupants of energy efficient homes.
- o Possible partial shift of cost of energy from economically disadvantaged groups to energy companies and other ratepayers.

Employment

- o No impact

SOCIAL

Housing Supply

- o May have benefit by making energy efficient housing more affordable.

Physical Mobility

- o No impact

Health and Safety

- o No impact

Sense of Community

- o No impact

Equity

- o Probable significant benefit in making energy efficient housing more affordable to own, rent, or operate for low income groups.

Urban Patterns

- o No impact

OBJECTIVE 5: TO INTEGRATE AND ENSURE CONSISTENCY OF FUTURE ENERGY PROGRAMS WITH EXISTING REGIONAL PROGRAMS IN ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND ALL OTHER REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES.

ENVIRONMENTAL

INSTITUTIONAL/FINANCIAL

ECONOMIC

SOCIAL

Air Quality

- o Possible benefits to air quality as measures to reduce energy consumption in transportation also reduce mobile source emissions.
- o Possible impacts if waste-to-energy facilities produce emissions.

Water Quality

- o Possible impacts if water quality objectives are modified, in certain cases, in order to achieve energy savings.

Physical Resources

- o Direct benefits in conserving or reusing materials from the solid waste stream.
- o Direct benefits in reducing amount of wastes to landfills.
- o Reduced use of energy in wastewater treatment may result in greater use of land for comparable results.

Energy

- o Direct benefits by building energy considerations into the air, water, and solid waste decision-making process.

Amenities

- o No impact

Financial

- o Direct Cost - Public
Cost to public agencies (BAAQMD, ARB, EPA, RWQCB, SWRCB, SSWMB) in implementing program
- o Fiscal Effects on Local Governments
o No impact

Institutional

- o May require increased coordination among environmental management agencies and energy agencies

Production of Goods and Services

- o No impact

Income and Investment

- o May require investment by private businesses to begin programs such as ridesharing.
- o May require investment by special districts and private companies in solid and liquid waste treatment equipment and development of new technologies.

Consumer Expenditures

- o Possible minor impacts where capital costs are passed on in form of fees or rate increases.

Employment

- o No impact

Housing Supply

- o No impact

Physical Mobility

- o No impact

Health and Safety

- o No impact

Sense of Community

- o No impact

Equity

- o No impact

Urban Patterns

- o May reinforce tighter development patterns by promoting higher densities and in-fill development.

Environmental

Air Quality

No reduction in air quality in outlying areas.

Water Quality and Supply

Outlying watersheds, estuaries, groundwater recharge areas, marshlands preserved.

Solid Waste

Sites could be reserved to meet regional waste disposal needs.

Physical Resources

Critical land areas preserved:

- (a) for managed resource production--crops, dairy products, livestock, fish, timber, minerals, energy;
- (b) for resource preservation--water, species, vegetation, wildlife habitats.

Amenities

Regionally significant scenic and recreation areas preserved.

Institutional/Financial

Institutional

Will require changes in local development regulations in some communities to preserve critical areas from development. Will require new institutional mechanisms among local governments for equitable distribution of costs and benefits where one or more jurisdictions reserve land areas that serve regionwide open space functions, for example, vineyards, dairy farms, waste disposal sites.

Financial

Reduction in infrastructure costs in outlying areas. New financial mechanisms needed to maintain open space areas to meet regional needs.

Economic

Production of Goods and Services

Development pressures on agricultural, timber, mineral production reduced.

Income and Investment

Lower land costs in outlying areas

Possible increased investment in resource production and management activities in outlying areas due to decreased development pressures and lower land costs.

Consumer Expenditures

No impacts.

Employment

No impacts.

Social

Housing Supply

Decrease in rate of housing construction in outlying areas.

Physical Mobility

Decreased mobility in areas not served by transit.

Health and Safety

Decreased vulnerability to natural disasters--earthquakes, flooding in undeveloped areas. Protection from possible contamination from waste disposal sites.

Sense of Community

Preservation of characteristics of rural communities.

Equity

Recreation and other amenities may not be easily accessible to the transit-dependent.

Urban Patterns

Retention of regional form of open space uses adjacent to and surrounding increasingly more compact urban areas.

Environmental

Air Quality

Reduction in regionwide pollutant emissions due to reduced rates of increase in auto travel.
No significant increase in localized CO emissions caused by traffic congestion in urban areas.

Water Quality and Supply

Outlying watersheds, estuaries and groundwater recharge areas preserved.
Reduction in rates of consumption of municipal and domestic water supplies.
Reduction in surface runoff regionwide.
No significant localized increases in surface runoff in urban areas.

Physical Resources

Increased consumption of land within cities and urban service areas; reduced consumption of undeveloped land in outlying areas.
Potential increases in consumption of lands in urban areas which serve recreation, hazard prevention and other open space uses.
Preservation of outlying critical environmental areas; reduction in damage to vegetation.
Reduction in conversion of agricultural land, mineral, timber, geothermal energy-producing areas to urban uses.

Energy

Reduced energy consumption due to reduced rates of increase in auto travel.
Increased consumption of transit related fuel.
Net overall reduction in transportation fuel consumption.
Potentially less consumption of energy through higher density housing in existing developed areas.
Since new construction outside existing developed areas could make use of more energy efficient technology, net impact unknown.
Decreased energy consumption per household unit regionwide in long term.

Amenities

Potential increases in urban noise levels--not significant at regional level.
Potential decrease in land available for recreation use in urban areas; protection of recreation opportunities adjacent to urban areas.
Preservation of scenic areas.

Institutional/Financial

Institutional

Greater coordination needed among agencies whose decisions affect development.
Significant changes in planning and zoning activities in some communities to increase densities, allow mixed uses, improve permit process.
Increased demand for all public services in existing communities; less demand in undeveloped areas.
May entail higher level of services in some communities, more efficient use of existing facilities and services in others.

Financial

Would use existing and currently planned capacities in the region's sewerage facilities; may result in lower taxes, user charges, etc.
Could mean major reduction regionwide in capital construction costs due to limited extension of public facilities.
Could result in more efficient solid waste collection and lower collection costs.
Increased assessed valuation in urban areas would result in slight increases in property tax revenues.
Increased revenues in urban communities from sales tax, fees, other user charges.
More jurisdictions eligible for State and Federal subventions and assistance where population is a determinant of eligibility and size of grant.

Could increase costs of public projects in urban areas (parks, airports) due to increased competition for land for residential development.
Public safety costs may increase due to adverse social effects of higher density development.
Increased government administrative costs for planning and zoning administration, relocation of displaced households.
Could cause fees and user charges to increase in areas lacking service commitments.
Continuing costs for ABAG associated with monitoring growth, updating local policy and development trend information to provide service, advocacy and review functions.

Economic Production of Goods and Services

Increased commercial activities in urban centers; less commercial growth in outlying areas.
Conducive to increased transit service.

Consumer Expenditures

Reduced expenditures for gasoline.
Increased costs of owner and rental housing.
Possible reduction in upward trend in residential and commercial energy charges.
Could make more disposable income available due to lower transportation costs.
May affect consumer housing preferences.

Investment

Lower regionwide demand for investment in public capital projects.
Emphasis of public/private investment shifted from outlying areas to urban areas for renovation and replacement.
Increases in higher density housing may affect the housing industry profit/cost structure.
Possible increased land prices in urban areas; decline in outlying areas beyond urban service lines.
Housing rehabilitation and maintenance industries stimulated; housing construction increased.

Employment

Increased job opportunities in commercial and industrial activities in urban centers.
Increased transit-related employment.
Increased employment in construction, rehabilitation.

Social Housing Supply

New residential construction reduced in outlying areas.
New housing construction and rehabilitation increased throughout urban areas.
Possible lag in new housing production as building industry adjusts to new development practices and housing types.
Could result in lower proportion of substandard housing units.
Could increase conversion of older, single-family structures.

Physical Mobility

Regionwide reduction in vehicle miles traveled.
Travel time savings due to shorter trips.
Increased transit availability for all trip purposes and all population groups.
Improved potential for walking trips.
Increased local traffic congestion where transit not available.
Inconvenience for private auto use.

Health and Safety

Significant public health improvement due to reduced oxidant concentration regionwide.
Greater exposure to localized concentrations of CO.
Possible increased pedestrian safety problems on local streets.
Increased vulnerability to natural disasters in urban areas.

Sense of Community

Increased personal time for non-work activities due to shorter commutes.
Increased demographic diversity of existing neighborhoods and communities.
Potential displacement of lower income people from existing communities.
Higher residential development may have adverse social effects.

Equity

Rehabilitation and rebuilding of substandard housing would displace many poor, aged, minority and handicapped residents.
Possible adverse effects on budgets of those on low or fixed incomes now living in urban areas.
Expanded transit availability for transit-dependent residents.
Could broaden housing opportunities for lower income people if lower per unit construction costs of multi-family housing are reflected in prices of housing to consumers.

Growth Patterns

Shift in residential development from outlying suburban areas to more centralized urban areas throughout region.
More multi-family housing in urban areas; more mixed use developments.
Residential, commercial, industrial development confined to existing developed areas.
Reduced consumption of undeveloped land.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C123308015

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUL 29 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

